

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

RICHARD LAWLER, 54271

PLAINTIFF

v.

CAUSE NO. 1:12CV325 LG-JMR

**LISA DODSON,
ANDREW FRANZ, and
COUNTY OF HARRISION, MISS**

DEFENDANTS

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND ORDER OF DISMISSAL**

BEFORE THE COURT is the Report and Recommendation of Chief United States Magistrate Judge John M. Roper, Sr. entered in this cause on November 1, 2013 [43]. Magistrate Judge Roper reviewed the Plaintiff's 42 U.S.C. § 1983 case, the three Motions to Dismiss, along with the entire record and applicable law. Magistrate Judge Roper determined that Motions to Dismiss should be granted and the 42 U.S.C. § 1983 claims should be dismissed as time-barred by the three year statute of limitations.

The Plaintiff did not file any objection to the Report and Recommendation.¹ Where no party has objected to the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, the Court need not conduct a de novo review of it. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) ("A judge of the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings and recommendations to which objection is made."). In such cases, the Court need only review the Report and

¹Plaintiff received the Report and Recommendation as evidenced by the Acknowledgment of Receipt. [44]

Recommendation and determine whether it is either clearly erroneous or contrary to law. *United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989). After reviewing the Report and Recommendation, the Court finds it is neither clearly erroneous nor contrary to law. Therefore, the Court finds that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge should be adopted as the opinion of this Court.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Report and Recommendation of Chief United States Magistrate Judge John M. Roper, Sr. entered in this cause on November 1, 2013 [43] should be, and the same hereby is, **ADOPTED** as the finding of this Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED AND ADJUDGED that the Motions to Dismiss [10, 20, 40] are **GRANTED** and the Motion for a More Definite Statement and for Production of Pleadings [30, 31] are **DENIED** as moot. This cause is **DISMISSED**.

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 9th day of December, 2013.

s/ *Louis Guirola, Jr.*
LOUIS GUIROLA, JR.
CHIEF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE